ACTIVE CASES Analysis May 2003 QA Results for Food Stamps

(as of 100% due date)

Sample Size: 93

(drops excluded)

Statewide Total May:

Total Issuance in Sample: \$15,964.00

Total Number Error Cases: 16

Error Amount Total: \$ 1,388.00

Percentage of Dollars in Error: 8.7%

FFY 2003 Error Rate YTD: 9.6%

Milwaukee County May:

Total Issuance in Sample: \$7,813.00

Tot Number of Error Cases: 6

Error Amount Total: \$ 741.00

Percentage of Dollars in Error: 9.5%

FFY 2003 Error Rate: 12.4%

Rest of State May:

Total Issuance in Sample: \$8,151.00

Total Number of Error Cases: 10

Error Amount Total: \$ 647.00 Percentage of Dollars in Error: 7.9%

FFY 2003 Error Rate: 7.3%

CHANGE REPORTING WAIVER (Phase 1)

A review of error cases that in the best-case scenario would not be considered errors under the new change reporting waiver shows the following results. The error rate for May would look like this:

Statewide Totals:

Total Number Error Cases: 14

Error Amount Total: \$1308.00 Percentage of Dollars in Error: 8.2% • Milwaukee County Totals: (under Phase 1 of Reduced Reporting)

Total Number of Error Cases: 6 (same) Error Amount Total: \$741 (same) Percentage of Dollars in Error: 9.5% (same)

• Rest of State Totals (under Phase 1 of Reduced Reporting)

Total Number of Error Cases: 8
Error Amount Total: \$567
Percentage of Dollars in Error: 7.0%

Statewide, of the 16 errors, 9 were agency preventable errors, and 7 were client "failure to report" errors—only 2 of which would be considered non-errors under new waiver. The rest would still be included as they exceeded the 130% FPL reporting threshold, plus one that would still be ineligible due to unreported assets. There were no CARES errors.

Overview of the errors and where they occurred:

- The good news is that Milwaukee has reduced its error rate for all the last 3 months. The bad news is the balance of the state error rate has increased in each of the last three months. Milwaukee possible causes could be success of the Milwaukee Change Center, luck of the draw, training. Rest of the State could be result of large increases in participation and thus caseloads, or luck of the draw. There was an upturn in the proportion of APES to client errors in the non-Milwaukee segment.
- **APES:** Of the 9 APE's, 4 were in Milwaukee, and 5 in balance of state. Type of APES (primary error-- some had multiple reasons):
 - 3 failure to correctly assess and budget earnings (plus 2 others as secondary reason) \$181 of total month's error.
 - 3 -incorrect budgeting of rent or utilities . \$152 of total error
 - 2 FS cases opened without an application (case had closed; agency reopened without new app and FTF interview. QC is required to use actual review month circumstances, which is very risky—caused \$293 of the total month's FS error
 - 1 failure to act on multiple DX on Unemployment Comp.
- Client non-reporting:
- Types of non-reporting errors:
 - 1- Failure to report assets over limit
 - 1- Failure to report new job

- 1- Failure to report wage rate increase
- 1 -Failure to report Unemployment Comp ended
- 1 –Failure to Report Participation in Tribal Food Distribution Program (renders them ineligible for FS for that month)
- 1-Ineligible Alien presented false documentation of alien status (Agency worker unaware of the SAVE secondary verification procedure)
- 1-Failure to report correct expense

Trends or Possible Recommendations?

- As mentioned, Milwaukee has been trending downward in their error rate over the last three months. Possibly due to successes with Change Reporting Center?
- Re-opening FS without a face to face interview and application continues to be a problem (2 cases).
- Client errors: five of the seven client error cases would still have been considered errors under the Reduced Reporting waiver Phase 1, since they would still be ineligible. The planned DXNH changes should address this somewhat.

"Biggest Contributors": The two cases that caused the largest dollar errors for May 2003 (including client errors):

(Milwaukee): \$278 error. ES Worker failed to act on two DX's regarding Unemployment Compensation.

(Dunn): \$212 error. Agency opened FS without an application or face-to-face interview. Consequently State QA was required to use the actual sample month income in the error determination. Because her sample month income was inordinately high the group failed the gross income test. Total issuance was in error.

mbw

9/26/03